

skill could open ballot boxes under certain circumstances can be considered as a serious defect in the polling arrangements. It was not alleged in the petition, and the petitioner has not produced any direct evidence to prove that any ballot box was actually tampered with between the date of polling and the date of commencement of counting as demonstrated before us by Jai Singh.

Paragraph 26 of the petition.—It is alleged that, shellac seals of all the ballot boxes were not on the ballot boxes, when they were brought to the counting tables. The Returning Officer stated that he found all the seals intact. The charge that shellac seals were missing from some ballot boxes is not established.

The second complaint under paragraph 26 is that, the persons counting the votes only opened the paper seals on the ballot boxes. This has been admitted by respondents's witnesses. The practice was to open the shellac seals at the table of the Returning Officer, and then to pass on the ballot box to a counting table where the paper seal was opened.

Paragraph 27 of the petition.—It is alleged that the official paper seals were of pink colour, but several ballot boxes carried white paper seals. Sri Radhey Shyam Pathak P.W. 1 said that, one or two ballot boxes had seals of ordinary white paper. He has filed a white label Ex. 2. He stated that when ballot boxes were being opened for counting votes, the paper labels were thrown away. He picked up the label Ex. 2 from there. Sri Radhey Shyam Pathak is an interested witness. The petitioner's evidence to the effect that certain boxes carried seals of white paper is not satisfactory.

It has been found that under certain circumstances a sealed ballot box could be opened without tampering with the shellac seal. Further, the shellac seal and the paper seal were broken at different places during the counting. But neither of these two factors affected the result of the election materially.

Issue No. 5.—The petitioner produced four witnesses for proving that Sukhdeo Ram Yadav canvassed for and helped respondents No. 1 and 2 in the election. Sri Nathu Ram (P.W. 4) stated that during the counting Sukhdeo Ram Yadav said that the Congress would win. If Sri Nathu Ram's statement on this point is true, the remark made by Sukhdeo Ram Yadav during the counting was improper. But observations made during the counting about chances of success of a certain candidate do not amount to canvassing. Syed Asad Ullah Kazmi (P.W. 6) was an honorary magistrate from 1948 to 1950. At present he is a member of the District Board. He stated that he found Sukhdeo Ram Yadav canvassing for Sri Sheo Kumar Pande at Nai Bazar. The witness admitted that he was in charge of the election of Sri Saligram in Sirathu circle. Syed Asad Ullah is an interested witness. He did not know Sukhdeo Ram Yadav before he was seen at Nai Bazar on the day in question. Syed Asad Ullah did not make any report against Sukhdeo Ram Yadav to his officers. Syed Asad Ullah is a resident of village Kara. Beni Prasad Sharma (P.W. 7) is a resident of Sarai Aqil. He stated that he found Sukhdeo Ram Yadav canvassing at Sarai Aqil and Manjhanpur. Beni Prasad admitted that he was also in charge of election work for Sri Saligram Jaiswal. The witness canvassed for him. Beni Prasad also is an interested witness. He did not complain to Sukhdeo Ram Yadav's senior officer. The petitioner (P.W. 11) has no personal knowledge about the alleged canvassing by Sukhdeo Ram Yadav. The petitioner heard about it from his workers. The petitioner stated that he telephoned to the Town Rationing Officer about Sukhdeo Ram Yadav's misconduct. But the petitioner did not make any written application against the inspector.

P.W. 11 is Sukhdeo Ram Yadav. He denied having canvassed for the Congress. He said that he was never an Inspector for Sirathu Manjhanpur circle. His circle Sarai Aqil was however, on the border of the Sirathu Manjhanpur constituency. He admitted that he had orders in those days not to visit villages. He obtained leave for 10 days during December 1951, when the election campaign was in full swing. The facts that the Inspector's circle adjoined Sirathu Manjhanpur constituency, and he took leave when canvassing was going on, are significant.

The statements of Syed Asad Ullah and Beni Prasad Sharma raise strong suspicion against Sukhdeo Ram Yadav. But no written complaint was made by the petitioner or his workers against Sukhdeo Ram Yadav during the election period. The petitioner's evidence to the effect that Sukhdeo Ram Yadav canvassed for or helped respondents No. 1 and 2 in the election is not convincing.

Issue No. 8.—This issue deals with the alleged omission to show certain expenditure in the returns of election expenses. Paragraph 29 of the petition deals with meetings addressed by the Chief Minister. The petitioner (P.W. 11) stated that there was a Congress meeting at Chamandah. The Chief Minister addressed that meeting, and advised the audience to vote for Sri Sheo Kumar Pande and Sri Sukhai Ram Bharti. The petitioner, however, admitted that he was not present

in the meeting. The petitioner did not produce any evidence to show that, either respondent No. 1 or respondent No. 2, incurred any expenditure in connection with the election meeting addressed by the Chief Minister. Sri Sheo Kumar Pande (P.W. 17) stated that he incurred no expenses in connection with that meeting. Sri Sukhi Ram Bhartiya also did not incur any expenses for that meeting. Since it has not been shown that either respondent No. 1 or respondent No. 2 incurred any expenditure in connection with the meeting in question, the question of omitting such expenditure from the returns of election expenses does not arise.

In paragraph 30 of the petition it is stated that, respondents No. 1 and 2 paid to the Congress Parliamentary Board Rs. 100/- and Rs. 50/- respectively for being nominated by the Congress. Respondent No. 1 in his written statement pleaded that he did not deposit the amount of Rs. 100/- from his own pocket. The implication is that, somebody also paid Rs. 100/- on behalf of respondent No. 1. The petitioner did not adduce evidence to show that respondent No. 1 spent Rs. 100/- from his own pocket. Since expenditure of Rs. 100/- by respondent No. 1 has not been proved by the petitioner, the question of omission of this item from Sri Sheo Kumar's return of election expenses does not arise.

Respondent No. 2 admitted having deposited Rs. 50/- with the U.P. Congress Parliamentary Board as alleged by the petitioner. But Sri Sukhi Ram Bhartiya's plea is that, that expenditure cannot be regarded as election expenses.

Chapter VIII appearing in Part V of R.P. Act 1951 deals with election expenses. The expression "election expenses" has not been defined in the Act. It is, therefore, rather difficult to say whether expenditure incurred before the date of nomination should be regarded as election expenses. The term 'candidate' has been defined in Section 79 of the Act "Candidate means a person who has been or claims to have been duly nominated as a candidate at any election and any such person shall be deemed to have been a candidate as from the time when with the election in prospect, he began to hold himself out as a prospective candidate." This definition appears in part VI of the Act. It is made clear in section 79 that this is the definition of the term 'candidate' for purposes of Parts VI, VII and VIII of the Act. So this definition does not in terms apply to election expenses dealt with in Chapter VIII (Part V) of the Act. But the definition of the term candidate appearing in Section 79 can be taken as a guidance for determining the scope of the expression "election expenses". The respondent No. 2 paid the U.P. Congress Parliamentary Board the sum of Rs. 50/- in order to secure Congress ticket. The Congress is a well established political party. Sri Sukhi Ram Bhartiya must have paid the sum of Rs. 50/- hoping that, nomination on behalf of the Congress party would improve his chances of success in the election. He paid the amount of Rs. 50/- with the definite object of getting elected in the General Election. So, although the expenditure was incurred before the date of nomination we consider that the expenditure amounts to election expenses as contemplated by Chapter VIII of R.P. Act, 1951. Respondent No. 2 should have shown in his return of election expenses the expenditure of Rs. 50/- under section 76 R.P. Act, 1951.

Now, we have to consider whether the omission of respondent No. 2 to mention the item of Rs. 50/- in his return of election expenses amounts to a minor corrupt practice under sub-section (4) of Section 124 R.P. Act 1951. Section 124(4) is: "The making of any return of election expenses which is false in any material particular, or the making of a declaration verifying any such return." We have shown that the expenditure of Rs. 50/- ought to have been shown in the return of election expenses. This is, however, not the same thing as saying that, respondent No. 2 is guilty of making a false return of election expenses. The charge under consideration is that of a minor corrupt practice. In 'Rajendra Singh versus Swarup Singh' (The Gazette of India No. 170 dated 30th June 1953 page 2191) the election Tribunal, Jullundhar pointed out that it is a well settled proposition of law that there can be no corrupt practice without a corrupt motive. Sri Sukhi Ram Bhartiya did not enter the witness box to explain why he did not show the item of Rs. 50/- in his return of election expenses. But it was for the petitioner to establish that, the respondent had a corrupt motive. The respondent need not prove his good faith. Sri R. N. Basu appearing for the petitioner conceded that the total expenditure of respondent No. 2 was far below the maximum fixed under R.P. Act 1951 and R.P. Rules 1951. There was, therefore, not much point in Sri Sukhi Ram Bhartiya's omitting this item of Rs. 50/- from his return of election expenses. Different Election Tribunals in India have given conflicting decisions on the question whether it is necessary to show such expenditure in the return of election expenses. The expenditure was incurred before the date of nomination. It appears that respondent No. 2 believed that it was not necessary to show such expenditure in the return of election expenses. We are of opinion that respondent No. 2 was mistaken in this view. But we do not think that respondent No. 2 acted with a corrupt motive. Sri Sukhi Ram Bhartiya's omission to show the expenditure of Rs. 50/- in his return of Election expenses does not amount to a minor corrupt practice under section 124(4) of the Act.

Issue No 9.—The prayer at the foot of the election petition is in these terms: "1. That the election to the U.P. Legislative Assembly from Sirathu cum Manjhanpur Constituency may be declared a nullity or void in law; 2. that the petitioner and the opposite party No. 10 may be declared as duly elected in the place of opposite parties Nos. 1 and 2 respectively. The prayer contains two separate reliefs. Sri Jagdish Swarup contended that in an election petition a petitioner cannot claim two reliefs jointly or in the alternative. This plea was not taken in the written statements. But we allowed Sri Jagdish Swarup to argue the point, as it raises a pure question of law.

In paragraph 48 of the written statements of respondents Nos. 1 and 2 it was pleaded that reliefs No. 1 and 2 asked for in the prayer are totally inconsistent with each other and cannot be granted. This contention appears to be correct. Under relief (1) the petitioner prayed for a declaration that the election is a nullity or void in law. Under relief (2) the petitioner prayed for a declaration that the petitioner and respondent No. 10 have been duly elected. Now if the election was a nullity, no candidate can be declared elected as a result of such void election. It is not possible to grant the petitioner both the reliefs contained in the prayer. Although the two reliefs are not separated by the word "or", we may regard the prayer as containing two reliefs in the alternative.

Sri Jagdish Swarup argued that R. P. Act 1951 does not permit a petitioner to ask for reliefs in the alternative. These reliefs have been enumerated in Section 84 of the Act. It is laid down in Section 84 that a petitioner may claim any one of these reliefs. It is not mentioned in Section 84 that a petitioner may claim two reliefs in the alternative. But we consider that a petitioner has inherent right to claim two reliefs in the alternative. It is often difficult for a petitioner to be sure in advance whether he would be able to establish a particular case before the Election Tribunal. So, to be on the safe side, he may claim two reliefs, in the alternative.

The petitioner proved a few minor irregularities during the counting of votes. But the minor irregularities did not affect the result of the election materially. The petitioner has further proved that counting of votes was not correctly done. This defect was serious.

Section 100 R. P. Act 1951 enumerates grounds for declaring election to be void. Section 100 contains three sub-sections. Under sub-section (1) of Section 100 the Tribunal has to declare the election to be wholly void, if the petitioner is able to establish one or more of the three conditions enumerated in sub-section (1). In the present case the petitioner has not established any condition mentioned in clauses (a), (b) and (c) of sub-section (1). So the election cannot be declared to be wholly void.

Under sub-section (2) of Section 100, the Tribunal has to declare the election of the returned candidate to be void, if the petitioner establishes anyone or more of the conditions described in clauses (a), (b) and (c) of sub-section (2). Clauses (a) and (b) of sub-section (2) deal with corrupt and illegal practices. In the present case no corrupt or illegal practice has been proved against any respondent. Clause (c) of sub-section (2) of section 100 is: "that the result of the election has been materially affected.....by any non-compliance with the provisions of the Constitution or of this Act or of any rules or orders made under this Act.....or by any mistake in the use of any prescribed form." In order to arrive at the true result of an election, votes of rival candidates must be counted correctly. R. P. Rules 1951 have been framed by the competent authority as authorised under R. P. Act 1951. Rule 46 of R. P. Rules 1951 prescribes the detailed procedure to be followed at the counting of votes. It is mentioned in rule 46 that, "the Returning Officer shall then count or cause to be counted the valid votes given to each candidate and shall record in the statement in form No. 14 the total number of votes so given to each candidate." This direction makes it obligatory that votes of rival candidates should be counted correctly, and that the votes so counted should be noted down in form No. 14 correctly. This was not done in the present case. There was a good deal of confusion and fraud in the counting of votes and in preparing form No. 14. These mistakes committed in the counting of votes and in preparing form No. 14 affected the result of the election materially, as regards respondent No. 1. The case falls under clause (c) of sub-section (2) of Section 100 R. P. Act 1951. So the election of respondent No. 1 must be declared to be void.

Section 101 deals with grounds for which a candidate other than the returned candidate may be declared to have been elected. The Tribunal can declare the petitioner as duly elected only if it is satisfied that the petitioner actually secured the majority of valid votes or that the petitioner would have obtained a majority

of valid votes, but for malpractices committed by the returned candidate. We are not so satisfied in the present case. Although we are setting aside the election of respondent No. 1, it is not certain that the petitioner secured the majority of valid votes. So we are unable to grant the petitioner a declaration that he was duly elected. There must be fresh election for the general seat of this Constituency.

Now we proceed to consider the petitioner's case against respondent No. 2. No corrupt or illegal practice has been proved against respondent No. 2. It is true that there was serious irregularity in the counting of votes of the petitioner and respondent No. 1. But this irregularity had very little (if any) effect, as regards the counting of votes of respondents Nos. 2 and 10, who were Scheduled Caste candidates. Respondent No. 2 won the election by a comfortable majority. The petitioner has not been able to show that the irregularities committed in the counting of votes were likely to disturb Sri Sukhi Ram's majority of nearly 6,000 votes. Since the result of the election of respondent No. 2 was not materially affected by the irregularities in counting, Sri Sukhi Ram's election should stand.

Sri Gopal Ji Mehrotra appearing for respondent No. 2 argued that the result of our finding on issue No. 7 is that, either the election of both respondents Nos. 1 and 2, should be upheld, or the election of both these respondents should be set aside. We do not think that, our finding on issue No. 7 has such consequence. Issue No. 7 was whether the petitioner is entitled to challenge the election of respondent No. 2, who is a Scheduled Caste candidate. We held that the petitioner is entitled to challenge the election of respondent No. 2. But there is nothing in our order dated 13th November 1952 making it necessary to set aside the election of respondent No. 2, simply because we are setting aside the election of respondent No. 1. Had the election been wholly void the election of respondent No. 2 also would have been void. But we have shown that the present case does not fall under sub-section (1) of Section 100 R. P. Act 1951 and the election was not wholly void. There should, therefore, be no difficulty in declaring that, the election of respondent No. 2 is valid, but the election of respondent No. 1 is void.

Since the petition has succeeded as against respondent No. 1 he should be ordered to pay the petitioner's costs, which we assess at Rs. 1,000. It is true that the petition is being dismissed as against respondent No. 2. But we have found that Sri Sukhi Ram Bhartiya was wrong in omitting the item of Rs. 50 from his return of election expenses. In these circumstances respondent No. 2 may be ordered to bear his own costs.

ORDER

The election petition is partly allowed. Under section 98 read with Section 100 (2) (c), R. P. Act, 1951 we declare the election of Sri Sheo Kumar Pande respondent No. 1 for the general seat in Sirathu-Manjhanpur Constituency in January and February, 1952 to be void. The election of Sri Sukhi Ram Bhartiya respondent No. 2 will stand. We declare that no corrupt or illegal practice has been proved against any respondent.

Sri Sheo Kumar Pande respondent No. 1 shall pay the petitioner Rs. 1,000 as costs. All the respondents will bear their own costs. The petitioner is entitled to obtain a refund of his security deposit of Rs. 1,000.

(Sd.) V. G. OAK, I.C.S.,—*Chairman*.

(Sd.) N. N. MUKERJI—*Member*.

The 15th December, 1953.

(Sd.) BABU RAM AVASTHI—*Member*.

ANNEXURE "A"

ELECTION PETITION No. 316 of 1952

ORDER

In this election petition the petitioner seeks for a declaration that, the election of respondent Nos. 1 and 2 is void. Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 in their written statements have pleaded that, the election petition is not in proper form, that it contravenes section 81 Representation of People Act 1951, that the petition is vague and the petition is consequently liable to be rejected. On these pleadings the following two issues, among others, were framed:

1. Is the election petition not in a proper form? Is it in contravention of section 81 R. P. Act? Is it liable to be rejected?
6. Is the election petition vague and liable to be rejected?

Findings

Issue No. 1.—No form for an election petition has been prescribed. Section 81 of the Act deals with presentation of the petition. The Election Commission has transmitted the petition to this Tribunal for disposal. So apparently the Election Commission was satisfied that, the presentation of the petition was proper, section 83 (2) of the Act prescribes a list of corrupt or illegal practices to be attached to an election petition. In the present case we do not find any such list attached to the petition, although there is in the petition at least one charge of a corrupt practice. However, there is no specific plea in the written statements that, the petition is defective for lack of the list prescribed in section 83 (2). So we may ignore this defect in the petition assuming that there is such a defect in the petition. We decide that the election petition is in order, and does not contravene section 81 R. P. Act. It is not liable to be rejected on this ground.

Issue No. 6.—We have gone through the election petition. It is quite intelligible. We were able to strike issues after examining the pleadings of the parties. If the petition is vague on any particular point, the respondents may raise the question at the time of production of evidence. The petition cannot be thrown out at this preliminary stage. We hold that the election petition is not vague, and is not liable to be rejected on the ground of alleged vagueness.

(Sd.) V. G. OAK, I.C.S.,—Chairman.

(Sd.) N. N. MUKERJI—Member.

(Sd.) B. R. AVASTHI—Member.

The 16th October, 1952.

APPENDIX "B"

ELECTION PETITION No. 316 OF 1952

ORDER

This is an Election Petition by Shri Salig Ram Jaiswal challenging the election of Shri Sheo Kumar Pande respondent No. 1 and Shri Sukhi Ram Bhartiya respondent No. 2. The election related to Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly from Sirathu-Manjhanpur Constituency in Allahabad District. This was a double-member constituency, in which one seat was reserved for a scheduled caste candidate. The petitioner was a candidate for the general seat. Shri Sukhi Ram Bhartiya respondent No. 2 and respondent No. 10 were candidates for the reserved seats. Respondents Nos. 1 and 2 were declared elected. The petitioner now prays that the petitioner and respondent No. 10 may be declared as duly elected in place of respondents Nos. 1 and 2 respectively. Respondents 1 and 2 filed written statements. Various pleas were raised in defence. Respondent No. 1 raised the plea that, Shri Ganga Prasad was a duly nominated candidate. But the petitioner did not implead him as a party to this election petition. So the petition is liable to be rejected. Respondent No. 2 raised the plea that, he was a scheduled caste candidate, and that the petitioner has no right to claim a relief of declaration in favour of respondent No. 10 against respondent No. 2. On these pleas the following two issues were framed:—

2. Was Shri Ganga Prasad a duly nominated candidate? Is he a necessary party to this election petition? If so, what is its effect?
7. Is the petitioner entitled to challenge the election of respondent No. 2 (a scheduled caste candidate)?

Findings

Issue No. 2.—It is common ground that, Shri Ganga Prasad was nominated as a candidate, and that he withdrew from candidature within the prescribed time. The question for consideration is whether under these circumstances it was necessary to implead Shri Ganga Prasad in the election petition. Section 82 of Representation of the People Act 1951 deals with parties to the petition. Section 82 states:—"A petitioner shall join as respondent to his petition all the candidates who were duly nominated at the election other than himself, if he was so nominated", Shri Ganga Prasad was at one stage nominated as a candidate for election. The question arises whether, in spite of his subsequent withdrawal from the election, he is to be deemed to have been duly nominated at the election for purpose of section 82 of the Act. To answer this question it is necessary to examine the process of nomination in some detail.

Section 32 of the Act deals with the nomination of candidates for election. Section 33 refers to presentation of nomination papers and requirements for a valid nomination. Nominations are scrutinised under section 36. Section 37 provides for withdrawal of candidature. Section 38 relates to publication of nominations. Section 38 states: "The Returning Officer shall, immediately after the expiry of the period within which candidature may be withdrawn under sub-section (1) of section 37, prepare and publish a list of valid nominations in such manner as may be prescribed". It will be seen that the Returning Officer has to prepare a list of valid nominations after excluding the nominations which have been rejected under section 36 or withdrawn under section 37. Section 38 marks a distinct stage in the process of nominations. When the Returning Officer publishes the list of valid nominations under section 38, everybody knows who the contesting candidates are. Obviously, if a nomination has been rejected under section 36, the person cannot be deemed to be a duly nominated candidate. The learned counsel for respondents found it difficult to state at what stage a candidate becomes a duly nominated candidate. It seems to us that, a candidate is to be deemed to be duly nominated, when his name appears in the list of valid nominations published under section 38.

Section 82 of the Act appears in Part VI. Section 79 occurring in Part VI contains some definitions. Section 2 of the Act also contains a few definitions. The terms "Candidate" and "Returned candidate" have been defined in section 79. But the expression "duly nominated" has not been defined either in section 2 or in section 79. It, therefore, appears that, the expression "duly nominated" has been used in section 82 in its popular sense. When a candidate withdraws his candidature under section 37, he is no longer actively interested in the election. His position is no better than that of an ordinary voter. The object of impleading a person to a proceeding is to give him a chance to oppose the proceeding if he cares. It is not practicable to implead all the voters to an election petition. An election petition is published under section 90 of the Act. Such publication is sufficient notice to the general public including voters and candidates, who have withdrawn under section 37. It seems to us, that, a candidate who has withdrawn his candidature within the prescribed time under section 37, cannot be looked upon as a duly nominated candidate. We hold that Shri Ganga Prasad was not a duly nominated candidate. So he was not a necessary party to this election petition.

The petitioner impleaded three persons, Shri Mewa Lal, Shri Jagdish Narain and Shri Prem Chandra as respondents Nos. 11, 12 and 13 in the election petition. It is admitted that these three persons were nominated as candidates, but they withdrew their candidature within the prescribed time. It was urged by the learned counsel for respondents that, the fact that Shri Mewa Lal and others were impleaded as parties to the election petition shows that such candidates are necessary parties to an election petition. It is true that Shri Mewa Lal and Shri Ganga Prasad were in the same position, that Shri Mewa Lal was impleaded in the petition, and Shri Ganga Prasad was not so impleaded. The question raised under this issue is a matter of some difficulty. That seems to be the reason why the petitioner impleaded Shri Mewa Lal and others in the petition as a matter of caution. We have pointed out that, such candidates are not to be treated as duly nominated candidates. Impleading unnecessary parties is not a serious defect in the proceedings. We decided issue No. 2 against the respondents.

Issue No. 7.—It is to be noted that the petitioner and respondent No. 1 were candidates for the general seat, whereas respondents Nos. 2 and 10 were candidates for the reserved seat. The question has been raised whether the petitioner, who was a candidate for the general seat, is entitled to challenge the election of respondent No. 2 for the reserved seat. It is to be noted that the election in question related to Sirathu-Manjhanpur Constituency, which is a double-member constituency.

Section 81 of the Act deals with presentation of petitions. Section 81 (1) states "An election petition calling in question any election may be presented ... by any candidate at such an election or any elector.....". This section recognises two classes of persons, who are competent to file an election petition. A petitioner must be either a candidate at such an election or an elector. The petitioner gave the statement that, he is a voter in Allahabad (City) Constituency, but is not a voter in Sirathu-Manjhanpur Constituency. Hence the petitioner was not entitled to present the election petition as an elector. We have to see whether he was entitled to present the petition as a candidate.

Section 54 of the Act deals with special procedure at elections in constituencies, where seats are reserved for scheduled castes. The illustration contained in section 54 shows that, the votes for the reserved seat may affect the result of election from the general seat. The returns for the two seats cannot be treated as two separate elections. Although the petitioner was not a candidate for the reserved seat, the petitioner and respondents Nos. 1 and 2 and 10 have all to be considered as candidates for this election. The petitioner's case is covered by the expression "any candidate at such election" used in section 81. We, therefore, decide that, the petitioner is entitled to challenge the election of respondent No. 2, who was a scheduled caste candidate.

(Sd.) V. G. OAK, I.C.S.—*Chairman.*

(Sd.) N. N. MUKERJI—*Member.*

(Sd.) B. R. AVASTHI—*Member.*

The 13th November, 1952.

[No. 19/316/52-Elec.III/9050.]

By Order,

P. R. KRISHNAMURTHY, Asstt. Secy.

The Gazette of India

सत्यमेव जयते

EXTRAORDINARY

PART II—Section 3

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 3] NEW DELHI, MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 1954

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

NOTIFICATION

New Delhi, the 2nd January 1954

S.R.O. 57.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act, 1948 (XXIV of 1948), the Central Government hereby directs that the following amendment shall be made in the Coarse Grains (Removal of Control) Order, 1954, namely:—

In sub-clause (2) of clause 1 of the said Order for the words "and the Gorakhpur Division of the State of Uttar Pradesh" the words "and eleven districts namely Gorakhpur, Gonda, Bahraich, Basti, Mirzapur, Jaunpur, Ghazipur, Ballia, Deoria, Azamgarh and Banaras of Uttar Pradesh" shall be substituted.

[No. FYII-656(15)/54.]

S. N. BHALLA, Dy. Secy.

